

REMARKS

Summary of Amendments

Upon entry of the response and remarks, claims 1 and 5 are amended, and claims 2 and 6 are canceled, whereby claims 1, 3-5, and 7 remain pending. Of the pending claims, claims 1 is independent. Support for amended claim 1 can be found, for example, in original claim 2. Support for amended claim 5 can be found, for example, in original claim 5. In addition, Applicant is amending the specification to correct a misspelling of the word “stacked,” and support can be found, for example, in the same paragraph. Applicant submits that no new matter is added.

Further, any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Foreign Priority

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledgement of Applicants' claim of foreign priority.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS**1. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the alleged admitted prior art as set forth at page 2, lines 1-16 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection in view of the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established by the alleged admitted prior art, for at least the following reasons. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires:

- 1) the presence of all claimed elements,
- 2) the motivation to combine the separate reference teachings, and
- 3) a reasonable expectation of success.

The Office Action fails to establish any of these requirements.

(1) The Combination of Cited Documents Fails to Disclose all Elements of the Present Claims

First, regarding the presence of all claimed elements, Applicant respectfully submits that even assuming, *arguendo*, that the combination of document(s) is proper, the requirement that all claimed elements be taught or suggested in the cited documents (*i.e.*, the alleged admitted prior art) has not been met.

For instance, with regard to the alleged admitted prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest at least a “skin”

material ... made of polystyrene," as previously recited in dependent claim 2, and now recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, it is admitted in the Office Action that the alleged admitted prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least this recitation. (See, Office Action, p. 3, first paragraph).

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1-4.

(2) There is Insufficient Motivation to Arrive at the Claimed Invention

Second, regarding motivation to combine the separate document teachings, to properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, assuming, *arguendo*, that the rejection is based on a proper combination, the combined teachings must disclose all of the recitations of the rejected claims and the cited document(s) must contain some suggestion or motivation for such combination. Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged admitted prior art fail to provide any motivation, let alone specific motivation to arrive at the claimed invention. Likewise, the Office Action does not contain a sufficient explanation to establish motivation as to how one having ordinary skill in the art would modify the admitted prior art to arrive at the presently claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that mere statements that it "is ... well known and would have been obvious..." (*see*, Office Action, p. 2) without pointing to specific support in the cited

document(s), or knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or some other source **is not sufficient** to satisfy the *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, the alleged admitted prior art fails to at least provide the specific motivation to arrive at the claimed invention, as further evidenced by the Office Action's admission that the alleged admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest at least a "skin material ... made of polystyrene material," as recited in claim 1. Moreover, nothing in the alleged admitted prior art cures this deficiency. As noted above, mere statements that it "is ... well known and would have been obvious..." (*see*, Office Action, p. 2) without pointing to specific support in the cited document, or knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, **is not sufficient** to satisfy the *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant emphasize that the motivation to modify a reference **must be explained**. *See In re Kahn*, No. 04-1616, slip op. at 8 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 22, 2006). The Office Action fails to indicate how the alleged admitted prior art can be modified to achieve the presently claimed invention, and thus, no explanation of motivation is present. Therefore, in view of independent claim 1, and the lack of explained motivation in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed method of manufacturing a low pressure injection type RIM mold would not have been obvious in view of the alleged admitted prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1-4.

(3) There Would Have Been no Reasonable Expectation of Success

Finally, despite the assertions in the Office Action, there would have been no reasonable expectation of success of achieving the specific recitations of the present claims. There is no reason to believe that Applicant's claimed method of manufacturing a low pressure injection type RIM mold would have resulted in view of the alleged admitted prior art.

As pointed out above, the alleged admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest at least a "skin material ... made of polystyrene material," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art cannot necessarily conclude that there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to arrive at the presently claimed invention because one having ordinary skill in the art cannot necessarily conclude that the claimed RIM mold would result, especially in view of the lack of disclosure in the alleged admitted prior art, which is silent with respect to at least the "skin material ... made of polystyrene material."

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently claimed method of manufacturing a low pressure injection type RIM mold would not have been obvious in view of the alleged admitted prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record, and allow each of the pending claims. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that an early indication of allowance of the application be indicated by the mailing of the Notices of Allowance and Allowability.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Su Yong PARK

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bruce H. Bernstein', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Stephen M. Roylance
Reg. No. 31,296

April 23, 2007
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191